



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

DATE: February 15, 2013

TO: Elizabeth Perry, Principal Planner

FROM: Wendy Block Sanford, Principal Planner/Transportation Program Manager *WBS*

SUBJECT: Transportation Comments – Reserve at Tinner Hill SE Application

The comments below are in response to the Conceptual Development Plan dated January 29, 2013 and the Transportation Demand Management Plan dated February 11, 2013.

1. Consider a tighter curb radius at the Maple/Tinner corner to match the radius of the corner across the street. A smaller radius would shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians. This intersection should be designed with a priority on pedestrian movements.
2. Continue sidewalks across the drive aisles.
3. Create two mid-block crossings across S. Maple Avenue. One could be located directly in front of the grocery lobby leading across to Pearson Square. A second one could be located in front of the residential main entrance. The locations should not place pedestrians in conflict with turning vehicles from either the proposed development or Pearson Square and should be clearly marked with signage and a visible crosswalk, corner bump outs, and curb ramps.
4. Show the location of bicycle storage facilities. Bicycle storage includes internal bicycle storage for residents as well as bike racks in the streetscape or in other public locations for visitors.
5. Consider adding bicycle amenities such as bicycle racks, a water fountain, and/or an air pump to the outdoor plaza.
6. The applicant should install a bus shelter on the S. Washington Street project frontage to create a new stop in this area. This bus stop will consolidate and replace the two nearby bus stops on S. Washington Street (in front of Elevation Burger and near the Maple Ave intersection). The placement of the bus shelter should be determined based upon consideration of WMATA bus stop guidelines (see Section 2 in the referenced link <http://www.wmata.com/pdfs/planning/WMATA%20Guidelines-Design%20and%20Placement%20of%20Transit%20Stops.pdf>.) The City will

work with WMATA to develop a recommendation for the exact location of the shelter. The City is in the process of developing a bus shelter standard.

7. The proposed TDM program should be strengthened to include outreach to nearby residents. For instance, the applicant should consider ways to attract pedestrians with a $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ mile radius of the project with various incentives (provision of carts to nearby residents, shopping discounts for those who walked, biked, or took transit to the store, etc).
8. The TDM program should provide more information about how residents and employees would be encouraged to walk, bike, or take transit to the site.
 - a. Consider distributing a brochure with the bus routes and schedules, nearby amenities, etc.
 - b. Consider providing an attractive display with real time bus arrival and departure information.
 - c. Consider sponsoring a program or contest for residents to reduce their automobile trips. This could be modeled off of Arlington County's "What's Your One?" program: <http://www.carfreediet.com/pages/whats-your-one/>.
9. The applicant should consider placing electric car charging stations in the commercial and residential parking areas.
10. The new signalized crossing at Tinner Hill should include pedestrian countdown signals and crosswalks.



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

DATE: February 11th, 2013

TO: Elizabeth Perry, A.I.C.P. – Senior Planner

FROM: Kirsten Munz, P.E. – Civil Engineer, DPW
Benjamin Thompson – City Arborist, DPW
Bill Hicks, P.E. – Director, DPW

SUBJECT: The Reserve at Tinner Hill – Special Exception request
Rev. 1

The Department of Public Works has reviewed the Special Exception application for the Reserve at Tinner Hill, including Conceptual Development Plan dated 9/10/12, Preliminary Redevelopment proposal dated 9/10/12 and Traffic Impact Study dated 9/21/12. Comments on the proposal are provided below.

Transportation

1. **[Required]** Dedication of right-of-way along Tinner Hill Street is required to provide the applicant's portion of the required 50' public right-of-way. The resulting right-of-way should measure 25' from the existing Tinner Hill Street centerline. This appears to require a dedication of approximately 18' of right-of-way adjacent to the subject site.
Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.
2. **[Required]** The Comprehensive plan specifies that South Maple Avenue shall consist of 60' of r/w with 48' f/c-f/c. Please demonstrate how this is met, or address why it is not. At a minimum, the City would prefer the right-of-way to be dedicated to the back of the proposed curb line along South Maple Avenue.
Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.
3. **[Required]** Public access easements should be dedicated along all public rights of way. A sample deed with standard dedication language is attached. In general, a 14' easement is recommended. Be aware that the City does not have interest in maintaining non-standard improvements within public access easements, so the plan should address how this will be achieved.
Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.
4. **[Recommended]** The garage & loading entrances along Maple Avenue create a 55' pedestrian crossing. Consider extending the median to provide a pedestrian refuge.

Rev. 1: This has been addressed.

5. **[Recommended]** The garage & loading entrances along Maple Avenue should be aligned with the existing entrance to Pearson Square, approximately 60' to the west.

Rev. 1: The applicant has not incorporated this suggestion.

6. **[Recommended]** The grocery loading area along Tinner Hill Street is located in close proximity to the intersection with South Maple Avenue. Consider relocating this loading area to a location that will not result in loading vehicles backing into an intersection.

Rev. 1: Staff maintains this concern with the current plan.

7. **[Recommended]** The South Maple Avenue – Festival Street/ Arts District option is not shown on the conceptual site plan. If this concept is pursued, it must be reflected on the site plan. The pedestrian zone shown in this alternative standard does not provide for adequate protection of trees and plantings in the proposed tree pits – please address.

Rev. 1: The current plan does not appear to show this option.

8. **[Required]** Ensure that the refuse area provides adequate space for trash and recycling receptacles and collection.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

9. **[Recommended]** Explore design alternatives at the intersection of South Maple Avenue and Tinner Hill Street to promote pedestrian mobility and safety. Some design concepts to consider may include a mini-roundabout (traffic circle) or intersection narrowing/ bump-outs.

Rev. 1: Crosswalks and ADA ramp improvements are shown, however Staff believes a more thought needs to be directed toward the design of this intersection.

10. **[Required]** The City's traffic engineering consultant, Sabra Wang & Associates (SWA) has reviewed the Traffic Impact Study submitted. A copy of their comments are attached, as summarized below:

- a. **[SW Comment 5b]** The development at 301 W. Broad Street should be analyzed as a grocery store use, rather than retail.

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- b. **[SW Comment 9 & 11]** A signal warrant study must be included to determine if a signal is warranted at South Washington Street and Tinner Hill Street.

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- c. **[SW Comment 9 & 11]** A project is planned for the intersection of South Washington Street and Maple Avenue, which will result in alignment modifications and a new signal. Please incorporate this plan into your traffic analysis.

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- d. **[SW Comment C]** Revise the traffic analysis to include the following:

- i. Traffic signal at South Washington Street & Maple Avenue,

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- ii. At the scoping meeting, it was agreed that site access to and from South Washington would be limited to right-in/ right-out only. However, the TIA was performed considering the intersection of South Washington and Site Access as full access. The analysis should be analyzed under both scenarios:
 - 1. right-in/ right-out only
 - 2. full access.

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- e. [SW Comment A] Although parking calculations have been provided in the Preliminary Development Proposal, the Traffic Impact Study does not analyze the proposed shared parking. Please include an analysis of the proposed parking plan and evaluate the adequacy of the shared parking proposed.

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- f. [SW Comment B] The TIA recommends the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management plan, however recommendations are not specific. Provide specific recommended quantities and supporting calculations for all suggested measures, including carpool/ flextime parking spaces, bicycle spaces in racks/ lockers. Identify which transit facilities are in reasonable proximity to the site.

Rev. 1: This comment still applies.

- 11. **[Required]** Please be advised that an approved Management of Traffic / Construction Management Plan shall be required prior to issuance of any permits.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

Stormwater

- 12. **[Required]** Calculations shall be required at the final site plan stage to demonstrate the following:

- a. Total runoff volume is not increased from pre-development conditions
- b. Additional 10% phosphorus removal is achieved.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

- 13. **[Recommended]** Applicant should treat all rooftop runoff with either a green roof or cisterns.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

- 14. **[Recommended]** Location of underground detention and utility vault in the pedestrian zone is not ideal. Consider locating these facilities within the building footprint.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

- 15. **[Recommended]** The existing inlet along Maple Avenue at the location of the proposed drop-off will require adjustment to coincide with proposed curb line. Consider removing

the bump out at the west side of the drop-off space and simply striping a drop-off zone adjacent to the four on-street parking spaces so that the existing curb line can be maintained, and the existing structure can remain.

Rev. 1: This has been reconfigured. Final design and calculations will be reviewed at Final Site Plan stage.

16. **[Required]** The applicant is advised that no improvements shall be permitted within the 100-year floodplain that result in an increase of the 100 year floodplain elevation by more than one foot. The structure shall be flood-proofed to the satisfaction of the Building Official.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

17. **[Required]** An erosion and sediment control plan shall be required at the final site plan stage. The applicant is advised to begin planning a strategy for runoff containment on-site.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

Streetscape

18. **[Required]** This plan must show implementation of the City of Falls Church's adopted Washington Street streetscape plan and demonstrate that those design elements are reflected in the current plan.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

19. **[Required]** All landscaped areas within the City's right-of-way (ROW) must show irrigation to be installed. This includes a water meter(s), control valve(s), and backflow preventer(s) located in the ROW that are accessible to the City at all times.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan. The applicant must be aware that compliance with this requirement will not allow LEED points to be claimed for irrigation.

20. **[Required]** Public access easements should be dedicated along all public rights of way. A sample deed with standard dedication language is attached. In general, a 14' easement is recommended. Be aware that the City does not have interest in maintaining non-standard improvements within public access easements, so the plan should address how this will be achieved.

Rev. 1: This comment will apply to the final site plan.

21. **[Required]** At the final site plan stage, the applicant shall be required to adequately specify the all materials and streetscape fixtures including but not limited to lights, trash receptacles and benches to ensure they are in compliance with City standard improvements. Additionally, a landscape plan shall be required detailing species, sizes and canopy cover.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan. The applicant has suggested the use of tree grates however tree grates are not permitted.

Urban Forestry

22. **[Required]** The plan must include a preliminary tree survey of all trees 2" and diameter or greater with recommendations for removal or retention as outlined in the City's development guidelines. This survey and resulting tree preservation plan must be done by an ISA Certified Arborist.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan.

23. **[Required]** The plan must show a Tree preservation plan that details tree locations and critical root zones, tree protection fencing, and other tree preservation measures including but not limited to pruning of roots or canopies, root padding, aeration, etc.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan.

24. **[Required]** The plan must show formal landscaping plans for the entire site, including upper level courtyards that show plant species, sizes, locations, and arrangements, with a corresponding schedule of plant materials specified.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan.

25. **[Required]** The plan must include all standard details for tree protection, planting, etc.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan.

26. **[Recommended]** Ensure that all powerlines are undergrounded to facilitate the growth of large canopy trees in the proposed areas.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan.

27. **[Recommended]** Increase the open size of the plantable tree locations to the maximum extent practicable.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan. Each tree should ideally have 1000 ft³ of soil that is favorable to healthy root growth.

28. **[Recommended]** Emphasize the use of Southern tree and plant species that may be more resilient to a changing climate. It may also be possible to select plant species that create connections between the proposed landscapes and cultural or historical elements of the site.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply to the final site plan.

29. **[Recommended]** To fulfill criteria for authorization of a Special Exception, the following recommendations are made:

- a. Decrease impervious area to provide for greater green space. This can be achieved by the implementation of a green roof or the utilization of pervious materials that allow water infiltration into root-able areas below grade, See "b" below.
- b. Connect tree planting areas with root-able soil below grade to facilitate healthy root development and tree growth.
- c. Install SilvaCells™ below pervious paving materials in areas of streetscape to increase soil volume for tree roots while creating greater stormwater holding capacity on-site. SilvaCells may be used to off-set other Stormwater BMP requirements.
- d. Add canopy trees and

landscaping to the public

plaza proposed for the Southwest end of the lot. This may be done in conjunction with SilvaCells as described above to turn the entire area into a stormwater detention facility that promotes healthy tree and root growth below grade without disrupting surface areas.

Rev. 1: This comment will still apply.

Additional Comments as of 2/11/2013:

30. **[Required]** Despite that parking is below-grade, the site plan is still subject to code requirements for internal parking lot landscaping. The purpose of internal parking lot landscaping is to provide shade for site users, reduce the heat island effect, break up expanses of impervious cover, intercept stormwater, and provide environmental and landscape amenity to the site. The applicant must demonstrate that the site provides such benefits that would otherwise be provided by the additional parking lot landscaping. This may be achieved in the form of a green roof, increased buffer widths beyond code requirements, or other creative means approved by the Department of Public Works.

MEMORANDUM

From: Jyothi Paladugu, P.E., PTOE,
Sabra, Wang & Associates, Inc.

To: Ms. Kirsten Munz, P.E. AICP
City of Falls Church

Subject: **540 S Washington Street Traffic Impact Study Review**
Published September 21, 2012

Date: October 9, 2012

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide comments on the subject report including existing conditions, future conditions and proposed mitigation. The comments herein focus on the technical content and accuracy of the report, including adherence to ITE methodology and recommended guidelines, validity of assumptions, and quality and consistency of data.

The site is proposed as a mix of uses including 21,300 SF Grocery Store, 4,635 SF of Restaurant, 3,975 SF of Retail, 10,580 SF Commercial Lease, and 224 Multifamily Residential Units. Overall, the study did follow the required analysis set forth by the City for Traffic Impact Analysis.

1. Does the study area include all likely affected intersection?

The study evaluated 8 intersections as follows:

- S Washington Street at Annandale Road, Hillwood Avenue, Site Entrance, Tinnars Hill Street, and S Maple Avenue.
- S Maple Avenue at Tinnars Hills Street, Site Entrance
- Annandale Road at Hillwood Avenue

The following 3 intersections are currently signalized:

- S Washington at Annandale Road
- S Washington at Hillwood Avenue
- Annandale Road at Hillwood Avenue

All other intersections are currently controlled by stop signs on the minor street.

Proposed access to the site will have one full movement access point along S Washington Street, and a second full movement access point along Maple Avenue.

Based on the proposed site access points, and existing traffic patterns, all critical intersections are included.

2. Is the existing roadway network accurately documented?

All of the intersections are accurately documented including traffic control and lane configuration.

3. *Is the traffic count data valid?*

Peak hour traffic data contained in the report is primarily obtained during June 2012 during the AM and PM peak hours. The Saturday data was obtained in July 2012. The count data was compared with the historical data and was found to be adequate and no discrepancies were found.

4. *Is growth in existing traffic volumes accounted for, and if so is the growth rate reasonable?*

A 1% annual growth rate was applied to the existing traffic volumes through the build-out year, 2016. This is a conservative growth rate, based on historical data which indicates a growth rate of less than 1%. The calculations were checked and found to be accurate.

5. *Are other future developments accounted for and documented? Are the trip generation and distributions for background developments documented?*

Two proposed developments were included in the analysis:

- a) 300 S Washington Street comprising 10 KSF retail, and 52 multifamily residential units located in the southwest corner of S Washington Street and Annandale Road intersection.
- b) 301 W Broad Street containing 68,500 SF of Grocery Store / Retail and 254 multifamily residential units located on W Broad Street between Maple Avenue and Annandale Road. ***The applicant assumed the 68.5 KSF as Retail development, where the proposed development will be a grocery store. The analysis should be revised to reflect the trips based on ITE's grocery store (850).***
- c) Pearson Square with 13,636 SF of Body Dynamic fitness club on S Maple Avenue between Tinnors Hill Street and S Washington Street.

The total projected trips from these developments are 303 AM, 348 PM, and 254 Saturday net new peak hour vehicle trips. The calculations for background trip distribution and total traffic volumes were checked and found to be accurate along N Washington Street.

6. *Is the horizon study year reasonable?*

A 4-year build-out (2016) was assumed in the report, which is appropriate considering the site excavation work necessary for a development of this size.

7. *Are the proposed trip generation rates explained and documented? Are the ITE land use categories appropriate? Are any trip discounts applicable (i.e. transit, pedestrian, internal capture and by-pass)?*

ITE trip generation rates for land use codes Commercial Lease (710), Grocery Store (850), Restaurant (932), and Specialty Retail Center (814) were selected and accurately calculated based on the 8th Edition ITE *Trip Generation Handbook*.

Pass-by trips were set at 25% for Grocery / Retail as per the scoping meeting and due the limited availability per the ITE. A trip discount for non-auto site access of 5% was applied to the office as per the scoping meeting due to the limited documentation of mode share data in the City. An AM 5%, PM 10% and Saturday 15% discounts were applied for internally captured trips per VDOT regulations and as agreed in the scoping meeting.

Credits for the existing site uses (SAAB Dealership) were also applied based on existing driveway counts. Overall, the site is projected to generate 256 AM, 528 PM, and 350 Saturday net new peak hour vehicular trips.

8. Does the trip distribution seem reasonable?

Assumed trip distribution is summarized below in Table 1

Table 1 – Summary of Trip Distribution for 540 S Washington Street

Land Use	Distribution
Grocery/Retail/Commercial/ Apartments/Restaurant	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 35% to and from the north on S Washington Street• 35% to and from the south on S Washington Street• 10% to and from the south on S Maple Avenue• 10% to and from the east Hillwood Avenue• 10% to and from the south on Annandale Road

The overall trip distribution reflects the assumptions at the scoping meeting.

9. Are there any other proposed capacity-enhancing transportation improvements in the study area by others?

The applicant proposes a traffic signal be considered at S Washington St and Tanners Hill intersection as part of the background improvements. The report mentions that a complete signal warrant analysis per MUTCD has to be performed to determine if a signal is warranted, and still recommends that a signal be considered at this intersection. ***A signal cannot be proposed without a signal warrant study. Therefore, the analysis (both Future Conditions without the proposed development and Future Conditions with the proposed development) should be performed without a traffic signal.***

In addition, the intersection of S Washington Street at Maple Ave would be rebuilt and signalized as part of the streetscape project. ***This is not considered in the study. The analysis should be revised to consider this improvement.***

10. Is the capacity analysis methodology correct? Are the calculations correct?

Existing, background and total future levels of service were calculated in the report at each intersection in the study area, using Highway Capacity Manual methodology in Synchro 7.0 software. The report found under existing conditions that movements at the following three intersections fail based on HCM analysis:

1. Eastbound S Maple Avenue during PM peak
2. Eastbound Tanners Hill Street during PM peak
3. Westbound Cavalier Street during AM and PM peaks

The existing year 2012 capacity analysis was independently checked using Synchro and the results shown are acceptable. ~~The results illustrate that under existing conditions all intersections (except for the movements mentioned above) operate at a level of service D or better.~~

Table 2. 540 S Washington Street Existing Conditions HCM Capacity Analysis – AM (PM) [Sat]

Intersection	Level of Service	Volume-to-Capacity	Delay
Annandale Road and Hillwood Avenue	C (C) [B]	0.69 (0.69) [0.50]	22.6 (20.3) [10.0]
S Washington Street at Hillwood Avenue	B (B) [A]	0.46 (0.56) [0.37]	11.5 (13.9) [8.5]
S Washington Street at Annandale Road	B (B) [B]	0.57 (0.58) [0.41]	18.0 (15.6) [14.7]
S Washington Street at S Maple Avenue*			
▪ Westbound Cavalier Trail	F (F) [F]	1.73 (2.59) [0.26]	673.1 (1587.1) [72.1]
▪ Eastbound S Maple Avenue	D (F) [D]	0.43 (0.86) [0.57]	29.7 (55.1) [27.4]
S Maple Avenue at Tanners Hill**	A (A) [A]	0.39 (0.39) [0.26]	9.3 (9.6) [8.7]
S Washington Street at Tanners Hill Street*			
▪ Eastbound Tanners Hill	C (F) [E]	0.08 (1.01) [0.28]	22.2 (276.9) [36.6]
▪ Westbound Tanners Hill	B (B) [C]	0.01 (0.01) [0.02]	15.0 (12.7) [21.3]

* - Stop controlled intersection, level of service, v/c ratio and delay are for stop controlled movements only

** - All-way stop

A future year 2016 capacity analysis was re-run including:

- 1) Growth in existing traffic volumes
- 2) Site traffic volumes for the pipeline background developments
- 3) Site traffic volumes for the 540 S Washington Street

The independent analysis did not consider a traffic signal at the intersection of S Washington Street and Tanners Hill Street. However, the traffic signal at S Washington Street and S Maple Avenue intersection was considered.

Table 3. 540 S Washington Street Year 2016 Future Conditions Capacity Analysis – AM (PM) [Sat]

Intersection	Level of Service	Volume-to-Capacity	Delay
Annandale Road and Hillwood Avenue	C (C) [B]	0.74 (0.70) [0.57]	24.1 (20.7) [11.4]
S Washington Street at Hillwood Avenue	B (B) [A]	0.48 (0.64) [0.41]	11.9 (16.2) [8.9]
S Washington Street at Annandale Road	B (B) [B]	0.66 (0.66) [0.46]	18.7 (18.3) [15.1]
S Washington Street at S Maple Avenue	A (C) [A]	0.55 (0.90) [0.45]	7.5 (28.2) [9.6]
S Washington Street at Tanners Hill Street*			
▪ Eastbound Tanners Hill	F (F) [F]	1.66 (5.20) [1.32]	472.9 (Delay exceeds Synchro HCM Range) [281.8]
▪ Westbound Tanners Hill	B (B) [C]	0.01 (0.01) [0.02]	14.1 (12.1) [15.9]
S Maple Avenue at Tanners Hill**	B (B) [A]	0.54 (0.51) [0.38]	11.2 (12.0) [9.9]
S Washington Street at Site Entrance***	F (F) [E]	0.27 (1.45) [0.40]	54.7 (345.5) [35.4]
S Maple Avenue at Site Entrance *	B (B) [B]	0.21 (0.31) [0.18]	13.0 (13.8) [11.5]

* - Stop controlled intersection, level of service, v/c ratio and delay are for stop controlled movements only & highest value is reported

** - All-way stop

¹ - NB & SB Washington Street through movements fail in AM (NBT) & PM (SBT)

² - EB Great Falls left-turn movement fails

The results of the independent future year capacity analysis indicate that without any improvements by the developer, the following movements fail;

- S Washington Street at Tanners Hill Street – Eastbound movements during AM, PM and Saturday Peaks
- S Washington Street at Site Entrance (full access entrance) – Site Access during AM, PM and Saturday Peaks.

11. Do the recommended improvements mitigate the impact and achieve desirable level of service?

The report proposed a traffic signal at the intersection of S Washington Street and Tanners Hill Street, so that the traffic would be metered and allows adequate gaps in S Washington Street traffic. Furthermore, the report assumes that the traffic would use the second access on S Maple Avenue due the delays at the access with S Washington Street.

As mentioned in No.9, a signal cannot be proposed without a signal warrant study. Therefore, the analysis (both Future Conditions without the proposed development and Future Conditions with the proposed development) should be performed without a traffic signal.

In addition, the intersection of S Washington Street at Maple Ave would be rebuilt and signalized as part of the streetscape project. This is not considered in the study. The analysis should be revised to consider this improvement

The following inadequacies in the report have to be addressed by the applicant in addition to the above recommendations.

- A. **Parking:** The report does not address parking. Add a section about parking to be provided.
- B. **Transportation Demand Management:** This section does not give a detail description of the TDM measures to be undertaken by the applicant.
 - a. *Provide details for number of carpool and flextime parking spaces.*
 - b. *Analyze the number of bicycle spaces required.*
- C. **Site Access:** Per the report, the proposed development has 2 site entrances (from S Washington Street and from S Maple Avenue). Both entrances would be provided as full access entrances. In addition, at time of scoping meeting it was discussed that the left-turns to and from the Site Access from S Washington St be prohibited and make the site entrance only a right-in/right-out only. However, the analysis was performed considering the intersection of S Washington St and Site Access as full access to and from S Washington Street.
 - a. Based on the analysis the Site Access approach fails to operate at acceptable LOS, i.e., LOS E and LOS F during AM and PM peaks, respectively.
 - b. The report also mentions that S Washington Street (left-turns into the site) operates at acceptable LOS and minimal queues for NB lefts. However, S Washington Street is 4 lane undivided in this section without left-turn lanes. The left-turning vehicles into the site may create a potential safety hazard for through vehicles (approximately 1400 and 1100 vehicles during AM and PM peaks, respectively) traveling north into the City.
Recommendation: Redo the analysis with traffic signal at S Washington at Maple Ave, Site Access as only right-in/right-out and full-access, and provide necessary mitigations.



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

DATE: February 13, 2013

TO: Elizabeth Perry, Senior Planner
James Snyder, Director of Planning and Zoning

THROUGH: Nancy Vincent, Director of Human Services

FROM: Kevin Denton, Housing Specialist II

SUBJECT: Reserve at Tinner Hill (Lincoln), Special Exception (SE) Application

On January 29th you provided Housing and Human Services with a memo requesting a review and comments of the SE Application for the proposed mixed-use development of 540 and 580 South Washington Street. After reviewing the application we have the following comments:

1) The Revised SE Application references an ADU contribution, "of about 6% of the total number of market rate units approved by the City." "Fourteen ADU's will be provided." The 14 ADUs represent 6.25% of the expected 224 proposed residential units.

On February 11, 2013 the City Council approved a revised Affordable Housing Policy that states,

"In general, a requirement of six per cent (6%) minimum of new units based on by right development will be provided as ADUs in each new multifamily housing development. The City may negotiate for a percentage above the six per cent (6%), depending on prevailing market forces and the unmet demand for ADUs. The specific additional percentage will depend on a variety of factors to each project, such as rental-or-sale-of units, size, location and other characteristics. City negotiators should undertake a reciprocal approach to negotiations with developers to ensure benefits accrue to both parties. Negotiable items for achieving greater than 6% ADUs include, but are not limited to partnerships, zoning, density, taxes, bonuses, reduction in fees and tax abatements. While the City prefers that the unit sizes and types be proportionately the same as the entire development, it recognizes possible tradeoffs with regard to amenities and placement of ADUs."

We concur with the 6.25% ADU concession and suggest that any SE negotiations include a consideration of additional ADUs or contributions to the Affordable Housing Fund..

2) The revised application includes a memo from Dave Lasso to James Snyder, dated January 29, 2013, which references ADU-related issues on parts of page 8 and 9. We suggest that the developer add language concerning Restrictive Covenants and waiver of amenity fees for ADU clients.

“The Developer agrees to accept Restrictive Covenants, which shall define terms and conditions of the ADU regarding issues including, but not limited to, rent control periods, waiver of amenity fees, and occupancy.”

3) Also in the January 29, 2013 memo from Dave Lasso, the following language appears: “The developer will provide additional contributions in line with similar developments within the City.” We support this statement and can provide assistance throughout the negotiations to help determine a reasonable contribution.



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 8, 2013
TO: Elizabeth Perry, Senior Planner
FROM: John C. Boyle, Zoning Administrator
SUBJECT: 540 S. Washington Special Exception

The following will serve as my comments regarding the special exception applications and conceptual development plan—

General

With regard to the special exceptions for height and residential use in the B-3 district, I have no comments other than to confirm that special exceptions are necessary to allow for the proposed height and mix of uses.

The Future Land Use map does call for the present business zoning to continue, within which special exception options are available.

Building height and setbacks

1. Previous comments regarding setback, height calculation and average grade are satisfied.
2. A wall check/building location survey is required at the earliest practical point in construction, preferably when the foundations have been set.

Parking

1. Show typical parking space dimensions on plan; must be 8.5 feet X 18 feet.
2. Show width of all drive aisles on plan; must be 23 feet where providing access to a parking space, 22 feet elsewhere, 16 feet for one-way travel.
3. Show the parking space count of each row on the plan.
4. The parking tabulation indicates 336 reserved residential spaces are provided towards the required 371 spaces, and indicates 35 spaces are shared with commercial uses. Residential spaces are not permitted to share with commercial parking and must be dedicated to residential only.
5. Proposed retail parking complies, provided it does not share with residential parking.
6. The use of raised walkways as vehicle wheel stops is encouraged over individual wheel stops per space.

7. The provided surface parking should be posted as timed parking for 1 or 2 hours, and cannot be reserved for a specific user.
8. Confirm loading spaces will not require backing out onto a public right of way.
9. Provide a parking space within the parking structure that is dedicated and posted for police/fire and emergency vehicle use located near the grocery store or commercial space entrances.

Other

1. Confirm the locations of all transformers; these cannot be within a street side yard unless below grade.
2. Signage—the architectural plan should include surfaces that are adequate in area and location to allow the mounting of all anticipated building signs; a uniform sign package depicting size, number and design of signs is encouraged and is advised to be a condition of all leases. It is advised that leases reserve control and approval of all signage applications to the building owner before submission to the City for permits. All signs require review by the Architectural Advisory Board (AAB), with permit approval by the Building Official and Zoning. When a sign package has been prepared, contact the Zoning office to be placed on a meeting agenda for the AAB.
3. Board Review—the conceptual plan is eligible for a courtesy review by the Architectural Advisory Board when sufficiently complete; the site plan, when available, requires AAB review for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Planning Commission. That board meets the first Wednesday of each month. Coordinate with the Planning staff for timing, and with the Zoning office for placement on that board's agenda.



CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: 17 September 2012

TO: Elizabeth S. Perry, Principal Planner

FROM: Debra L. Gee, Planning Specialist

SUBJECT: The Reserve at Tinner Hill – Preliminary Redevelopment Proposal, 540 South Washington Street

Following a review of the Preliminary Redevelopment Proposal, I have the following comments and questions:

1. In the letter dated September 10, 2012 (Tab 1), the developer is to be commended for the following commitment on Page 2:

The celebration of the African American Heritage of this area and nearby Historic Landmarks associated with the Tinner Hill Community is an important element of this project. The design concept includes for the City's consideration a historic trail along S. Washington Street that will contain memorials that tell the story of Tinner Hill leading to the exiting (existing?) Tinner Hill Memorial. The project includes a commitment to making crossing S. Washington Street safer for vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians.

The next submission should clearly articulate in writing and in drawings how the crossing of South Washington Street to be provided will connect to and relate with the Tinner Hill Heritage Walking Trail. The proposed memorials should be described as to materials to be used, placement along South Washington Street, text (if any) on the memorials, and how these features will compliment the proposed Tinner Hill Heritage Walking Trail.

2. In the submission, on Page 6, there is text and renderings of the proposed Gateway Park. One line in the drawing extends from a point along the pedestrian path to a notation reading, "Relocated Historic Monument". What is the current location of this monument? What is the rationale for moving the monument? What, if anything, will replace the current monument?
3. The two parcels (540 and 580 South Washington Street) are already named; thus the City's Historical Commission will not need to propose a name for the parcels. The parcel at 540 South Washington Street is named "Parcel A, Crocker Square". The parcel at 580 North Washington Street is named "Lot A, Grill & Harvey".
4. Following the resubmission of materials, the Historical Commission should be consulted concerning the style of the monuments selected, the text (if any) to be placed on the monuments, and the potential relocation of an existing monument.